

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 9-14, 54 and 56 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8, 15-53, 55, 57 and 58 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e) AND §103(a)

Claims 9-10, 54, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,995,099 to Horstmann (hereinafter, merely “Horstmann”).

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Horstmann in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,724,595 to Gentner (hereinafter, merely “Gentner”).

III. RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS

Claim 9 recites, *inter alia*:

“...automatically building a customized web page or web pages of the first type for an owner of the one or more second-type of web pages based at least on industry specific information and definitional web site information input by a builder of the one or more first type of web pages...” (Emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully submit that nothing has been found in Horstmann and Gentner, taken alone or in combination, that would disclose or render predictable the above-identified features of claim 9.

As amended, claim 9 recites automatically building a customized web page or web pages of the first type for an owner of the one or more second-type of web pages based at least on **industry specific information and definitional web site information input by a builder of the one or more first type of web pages**. This feature is distinguished from the art used as a basis of rejection since neither Horstmann nor Gentener disclose or suggest or render predictable that it is possible to build a web page of the first type, which a user has the ability to edit, for an owner of a second-type of web pages, which a user does not have authority to edit, based on information input by a builder of the one or more first type of web pages. Indeed, claim 9 specifies that there are two types of web pages and the building process can utilize both types.

Regarding claim 9, the Office Action states, that Horstmann discloses “that based on information input by a builder of the one or more first type of web pages automatically building a web page of the first type for an owner of the web page of the second type of pages.” The Office Action cites column 4, line 43 – column 5, line 33 of Horstmann as disclosing such a feature.

However, the cited section of Horstmann in fact describes the generation of a links page and fails to teach or suggest building a user-customized web page or web pages of the first type for an owner of the one or more second-type of web pages based at least on industry specific information and definitional web site information input by a builder of the one or more first type of web pages. Horstmann merely discloses the use of a form that is displayed to a user to solicit link information for the creation of a links page. The links page as disclosed in Hortsman is not generated based on industry specific information and definitional web site

information input by the builder. Therefore the invention as recited in claim 9 operates in a different manner from the disclosure of Hortsmann.

Therefore Applicants submit claim 9, is patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the reasons stated.

Independent claims 54 and 56 recite similar or somewhat similar features.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims 54 and 56 are also patentable.

IV. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance and request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By



Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800